

# **REV. JACOB BAILEY**

**HIS CHARACTER AND WORK\$**

**BY CHARLES E. ALLEN**

**Read before the Lincoln County Historical Society  
November 13, 1895**

PRINTED BY THE SOCIETY  
1895



## REV. JACOB BAILEY.

MISSIONARY OF CHURCH OF ENGLAND ON KENNEBEC RIVER.

1760—1779.

HIS CHARACTER AND WORK.

BY CHARLES E. ALLEN.

*Read before the Lincoln County Historical Society, November 13, 1895.*

If American History, in that process of re-writing which now seems to be taking place, is to be correctly written, many fallacies or fictions, as well as much prejudice in the mind of the average American, must be outgrown. History can never be correctly written while hatred for even a greatly mistaken political or religious enemy or opponent exists in the mind of the chronicler, or is cherished by his readers.

By no means least among our hatreds, as a people, is that which has been for so many years cherished against those people who, at the time of the war for American Independence, remained firm in their loyalty to their English Sovereign, and who have long been known as Loyalists, sometimes derisively as Tories, or sympathetically as Refugees. And why? Since at the outbreak of hostilities, all colonists were so loyal that they fought the battles of Lexington and Concord, and of Bunker Hill in the name of their sovereign, it being with them a sort of legal fiction that they were only contending against the illegal acts of the parliament and of the king's officers, and not against their lawful ruler.

My present paper will deal with one such Loyalist, the Rev. JACOB BAILEY, the first Missionary of the Church of England, on Kennebec river; and I trust that I may not be thought disloyal to that government which I had the honor, in a humble way, to aid in defending in the civil war of 1861, if I affirm that an examination of what remains of the vast volume of papers which he left, has caused me to become very much his champion, and to sympathize with him most fully. When Rev. Mr. Bartlet wrote the "Frontier Missionary" some forty years ago, much material he could not use had he wished to, be-

cause of prejudice. Some matters he was obliged to arbitrarily suppress for the same reason, but in his admirable and painstaking work he aimed at justice for his subject, and succeeded so far as circumstances would permit. But even in his preface to that work, the late Bishop Burgess, who seems by writing that preface to have indorsed Mr. Bartlet's book, naturally enough, perhaps, fails to fully comprehend the character of Mr. Bailey, while William Willis, writing for lawyers, knew so little about Bailey that he calls him eccentric.

It is my wish, in this paper, to deal wholly with matters which have never appeared in print, and yet an introduction of the subject requires some reference to and quotation from the "Frontier Missionary." It will be new to those who have never had the pleasure of reading that book, and may serve to refresh the memories of those who have. I shall emphasize the fact, hinted at in that work, that the bitter opposition to Mr. Bailey was really the Puritan's narrow opposition to the Church of England, his Loyalty to the English King being only a pretext.

Jacob Bailey was born in the town of Rowley, Mass., in 1731. The boy, like the man of later years, although just a little smutted by some social corruption of the times, was greatly superior to his surroundings. Socially, he was very poor, of very poor parents, and hence socially, he was low, very low, for society, so called, generally grades its members by any standard other than that of moral worth, or intellect. He entered Harvard College at the age of 20, and graduated therefrom in 1755, at the foot of his class, because the Puritan Commonwealth of Massachusetts was far from Democratic, and his social position was at the foot. He taught school in several Massachusetts towns, having among his pupils a class of young ladies some years before Puritan Boston thought it prudent to admit girls to her public schools. Born a Congregationalist, he preached for a while as minister of that sect until he came to examine the tenets and discipline of the Church of England. His change to that communion was certainly unselfish, for Episcopacy was then far from popular in Massachusetts. Nor was his field of labor such an one as would have been chosen by a self-seeker. His change of faith, too, was the occasion of some bitterness on the part of many of his acquaintances, of which fact some of his letters of that period give evidence.

In religion, the motley company of humble settlers, such people as make a state possible everywhere, and who were, at the solicitation of

Church

the Plymouth Company, gathered at the old Kennebec plantation of Frankfort, was very much mixed. A list of their names, in Bailey's handwriting, with his designations affixed thereto, gives us Roman Catholics, Presbyterians, Calvinists, Lutherans, <sup>Baptists</sup> Independents, Quakers, and people without religious preferences. Among them were those who could not speak English, nor understand it very well when they heard it spoken; and when Mr. Bailey afterwards became their minister it was somewhat amusing to him to note the earnestness with which they looked at him as they tried to comprehend his words. These were the French refugees who, with their neighbors, asked in November, 1759, that the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, would send this young man to them for their religious teacher, he taking the place of Mr. McClellan, who had shown himself un-fitted for the work. As Frankfort and the settlements along the westerly side of Sheepscot river were the following year, as the town of Pownalborough, made the shire town of the new County of Lincoln, Mr. Bailey's position became not only prominent, but important. It was the first town in New England where the Episcopal church was established at the commencement of the town. It was a field unoccupied and unclaimed by any body of Christian worshipers, if we may except Catholics, for Massachusetts Puritans cared little about religion in the wilderness of Maine except to oppose somebody who might interfere with that system of fraud which they dignified by the name of trade with the Indians.

Can we of to-day realize just what this section of country was 135 years ago? Mr. Bailey's picture is a vivid one, and as I hope to show you that picture in the course of this paper, I will now simply remark that it was a wilderness of wild animals, flies, fleas, mosquitoes, and of Indians who might have been friendly, but who had been made hostile by repeated acts of perfidy on the part of white sanctimonious long-faces, as Mr. Bailey calls them. There were no roads worth mentioning, and very little cleared land. The people were very poor, but not very ignorant. It is a mistake to suppose that poverty and ignorance always go together. Some of them were Irish, and others were French, two peoples which Puritans, with Englishmen, always misrepresented and misunderstood. Indeed, Mr. Bailey himself shared the current prejudice against the French, which, however, afterwards became with him very much modified. And he was earnest in defending the French who were of his little flock from misrepresentation by people

who knew too little to understand them, or regarded them as chattels. He took much pains to study their language.

But I am anticipating. In Mr. Bailey's manuscript, "Journal of a Travel from Gloucester in New England to London in Great Britain; and from thence to Pownalborough on Kennebec River," we find that he commenced his pilgrimage on Thursday, December 13, 1759, and he walked from the fishing town to the metropolis. Much of this part of his journal is quoted by Mr. Bartlet. He tarried in Boston and in Cambridge almost a month before he could complete arrangements for his journey and secure a passage across the Atlantic, which was finally obtained in a dirty, dingy little cabin in the British war-vessel called the Hind, Capt. Bond. While he tarried in Boston he seems to have been the favored guest of the celebrities of the Episcopal church, and of others. On shipboard he was surrounded by officers who were "pompous nobodies," and by squalid sailors, all officially profane, and nearly all needlessly drunken even for an Englishman in those times. One wonders if the discipline on the Hind was a fair sample of British naval discipline in the 18th century.

Despite his dismal surroundings, his greasy hammock, his terrible seasickness, and the roughness of this winter voyage across the ocean, he kept a very minute journal, noting often even the distance sailed by the ship on certain days. But that it would crowd out matter which is more important for us now, I would be pleased to give you some records omitted in the *Frontier Missionary*, for I am confident they would interest you. I reluctantly pass them by, although I cannot refrain from presenting an anecdote or two illustrating his style of story-telling. All his writings are distinguished by a minuteness, a faithfulness to detail, dear to the true lover of history, although tiresome to those who mistake that delirium of fever, which we of to-day call progress, for real advancement. He is much amused at a certain Deacon W. who called upon him at his lodgings, and who was wealthy, and he relates that when travelling with a young man, the latter proposed tarrying for dinner at a certain inn which they passed. The thrifty Deacon answered that he had a friend living a short distance along the road, and invited his young companion to dine with him there, assuring him that both would be welcome. Soon they arrived at a hovel occupied by an old cripple and his wife, who earned a subsistence by making brooms. The travellers were invited to a meal of porridge, that being the best the couple could furnish, and of which

the hungry travellers partook and proceeded on their way. At the time for the next meal they found themselves at an inn, when the Deacon claimed that as he had been the means of securing his companion a dinner, he should now return the favor by paying for both meals at the inn, which the young man did, and took care to travel no farther in the Deacon's company. That young man was no doubt himself.

At 12 o'clock on Saturday, the 16th day of February, 1760, and 28 days after leaving Nantasket, the Hind dropped anchor in Portsmouth harbor; and while our young candidate for Episcopal ordination stood upon deck gazing longingly at the shore, the Lieutenant of marines said to him:—"Now, Mr. Bailey, you have a view of a Christian country, which you had never an opportunity of seeing before," and he further intimated that he looked upon the people of New England as a barbarous and inhospitable generation. Mr. Bailey was prevented from landing that day, and he wrote out a description of the Isle of Wight. The next day—Sunday—he took a joyful leave of his dirty prison ship, although he expresses regrets at parting with the friends he had made among the ship's company. Arrived on shore, he met with sundry adventures which led him to think that many of the people of this Christian country were far worse than those of the Boston he had left. In fact his descriptions, both of scenes in England and of social customs and manners in New England, might be commended to those who bewail the degeneracy of the present times. Stripped of the more objectional passages—for writers wrote more freely in those days—they would interest if I had space to present the details in the compass of an address like this. I hope that much of the detail may yet find its way into print.

On the way to London by "stage machine," he gave a minute description of the towns passed through. In one place, Guilford, while the coach changed horses he went into a shop to make some purchases. Making some inquiry about English walnuts, the surprised shop-keeper asked him where he lived that he didn't know about them. When told New England, the astonished shop-keeper exclaimed, "Is it possible for a person educated in New England to speak such good English! Why, sir; you speak as plain English as we do." A crowd having been collected, Mr. Bailey found himself the center of a group of wondering Britons.

Arrived in London, he is struck by the grandeur of the buildings, although he pronounces the road over which he has travelled to be

worse than those in New England. This, remember, was 135 years ago. While in the metropolis, waiting for the very slow movement of church dignitaries, he visited Dr. Franklin and other celebrities, inspected Westminster Abbey and wrote an elaborate description of that historic church. Finally, on the 2nd of March, 1760, Zachary, Bishop of Rochester, affixed the seal of the dying Thomas Sherlock to the certificate of Mr. Bailey's ordination as Deacon of the Church of England, and 14 days later he was ordained Priest by the Bishop of Peterborough, taking the ordination oath which he felt himself bound by during the troublesome years which followed.

On his return to his native land he made the following entry in his journal :—"Wednesday, May 28. About ten to our inexpressible joy made the mountains of Adimenticus, on the coast of New England, having been out of sight of land from Cape Cornwall in Britain 32 days. These hills bore from us at noon W. N. W. about 9 leagues and made something like this appearance"—followed by a drawing of their outline. On the 1st of July following he became "Itinerant Missionary on the Eastern Frontier of Massachusetts Bay," living at first with Major Goodwin in the Barracks of Fort Shirley, afterwards in Fort Richmond, in 1766 in a log house in Pownalborough, and finally in the parsonage built in 1770. He conducted services where he could find room, chiefly in the court house, until St. John's church was built in 1770, it being the first Episcopal church edifice completed east of Portland, unless we except the chapel of Fort St. George in 1607. Matters seem to have run quite smoothly with our young missionary until he succeeded in obtaining a grant of land for the proposed church. Certain it is that the missionary field was unoccupied when he und ~~und~~ took it. And it is evident that he was ambitious, zealous, industrious, and painstaking, often subordinating his own interests to the good of his parish. His scholarship was good, his reading extensive, his abilities of a high order. I regret that I find his sermons to be very dull when compared with his miscellaneous writings, which are very entertaining, and often sparkle with wit and humor.

The first intimation he received that there was any opposition to him he had in the conduct of Charles Cushing, who from being a regular attendant at church got to absenting himself therefrom. In addition to this he found reports circulated reflecting upon himself as man and as minister. Among papers which he left is a copy of a manly letter addressed to Cushing asking for an interview and hoping that

Cushing would tell him as a brother why he had taken offence. No notice was taken of his request. He afterwards found that Jonathan Bowman was the real leader in the opposition to him, which opposition grew so formidable that Mr. Bailey at one time seriously contemplated asking for removal to another station. These two gentlemen, Jonathan Bowman and Charles Cushing, were the "M" and "N" of Bartlet's "Frontier Missionary." William Cushing, afterwards Judge, seems to have been Mr. Bailey's friend.

What was the nature of this opposition, and why did these men become enemies to our missionary? The reasons were incidentally religious, but chiefly less worthy motives actuated them. They were of that Massachusetts Puritan stock whose faces were sternly set against any church but their own—a people which, when pious were very pious, but seldom very good. Frankfort had been settled by poor immigrants eight years before the establishment of the Courts at Pownalborough, and the arrival of lawyer adventurers in the section. The poor Calvinists and Lutherans were evidently a religious people. They asked for Mr. Bailey to be sent them, but they had no conception of the means adopted by shrewd adventurers acquainted with the many inconsistencies of English law, relative to land titles, to increase their estates at the expense of their unfortunate neighbors. When Mr. Bailey first came to these people, he was often amused at their efforts during divine service to comprehend the meaning of his words. They spoke French and German. Their pastor became interested in them and they venerated him in return. Bowman and his party were jealous of his influence, especially when Mr. Bailey sought to follow the example of the Catholic missionary at Norridgewock some forty years before, and tried to come between his people and these schemers. His writings speak of the low estimate in which his people were held, and he sought to correct that estimate. Englishman and Puritan alike hated a Frenchman and robbed him as mercilessly as they did an Indian.

One of the most pathetic stories which it has ever been my fortune to study is that of the Acadians, as shown in the volume of Massachusetts State papers, labelled "French Neutrals." It was Massachusetts Puritan hatred of anything Catholic or French that led to the removal of the Acadians from their homes in 1755. I incline to the belief that the claim of several writers, all Protestants, that it was a crime without a parallel in history is hardly an exaggeration.

When Frankfort was being settled and Pownalboro' incorporated, Massachusetts was engaged in placing these unfortunate exiles—anywhere, to get the detested French out of her way. Some were sent to towns in Maine, but none to Pownalboro', I think. This incident, no doubt, tended to embarrass Mr. Bailey. His parish in Pownalboro' was largely composed of Frenchmen, and he was looked upon as the champion of an alien church and an alien people. What more was wanted? His opponents care nothing for religion. His church was free for the poorest. After being defeated in their schemes, they became quiet for a time, until the troublous times of the revolution came. That gave them an opportunity which they improved to the extent of driving off the missionary, and enriching themselves at the expense of confiscated estates. Dr. Johnson remarked that "Patriotism was the refuge of the scoundrel." None so patriotic as those who are enabled to enrich themselves at the expense of political opponents.

Mr. Bailey was a loyalist; and it is commonly supposed that opposition to him was solely on that account. Jonathan Bowman and Charles Cushing, as officers of Lincoln County, were solemnly sworn to bear true faith and allegiance to his Majesty, George the 3d; and that they would give information of any conspiracies against his person, crown, or dignity; and indeed in a letter dated Feb. 6, 1772, thanking Gov. Hutchinson for his commission, Cushing says, "It is not in my power to make your excellency better amends than by endeavoring at such a life as shall denominate me one of his majesty's faithful subjects." Can we wonder when we consider that only a few years later, while Cushing still held that commission, Mr. Bailey asked the question, "Will Col. Cushing, as sheriff of Lincoln county, dare imprison a man for refusing to take up arms against his sovereign?"

When our missionary's name was placed in a list to be considered by his townsmen, for transportation, the qualified voters of Pownalboro in town meeting voted to strike his name from the list, along with Abiel Wood and others; and Bailey sent the Committee of Safety a letter assuring them that if they would permit the loyalists of Pownalborough to enjoy their homes and property in peace, they would pledge themselves to be quiet and refrain from giving either aid or information to the enemies of Congress; but they could not conscientiously renounce their allegiance to their sovereign. Before matters had gone so far, however, his friend and patron, Dr. Gardiner, wrote him sharply for even reading a thanksgiving proclamation issued by the provincial

Congress. And yet there are those who think that Bailey was stubborn. The reason for his refusal to read the Declaration of Independence are best given in his words. Of that Mr. Bailey writes:—On the 22nd of September, immediately after divine service, instead of reading the Declaration of Independency, I said, "Some of you perhaps expect that I should read a paper, but I cannot comply without offering the utmost violence to my conscience, and I solemnly declare in the presence of this assembly that my refusal does not proceed from any contempt of authority, but from a sacred regard to my former engagements, and from a dread of offending that God who is infinitely superior to all earthly power." Finally, every other means proving ineffectual, Cushing, Bowman, Hambleton and Carleton, the committee, summoned him to trial at the court house on the 28th of October. The first count in the indictment charged him with preaching sedition, and they had one or more witnesses, whereupon Mr. B., upon the principal of giving them the best evidence, read the sermon complained of. It seems that Samuel Goodwin, Jr., was the chief witness, but when Bailey read the seditious discourse Goodwin's testimony was not needed. The refusal to read the Declaration of Independence was next considered, and after reading his ordination oath to them, the parson proceeded to say that this declaration afforded little satisfaction to the committee, and Cushing asked him a number of ensnaring questions, among them whether if the king had broken his coronation oath that did not absolve his subjects? To this inquiry, Mr. Bailey replied that the falsehood and treachery of one party could never justify the baseness and perjury of another. "As for instance, no engagements are more solemn and binding than the marriage vows, and if the husband commit adultery the wife may not have liberty to commit the same crime." This was intended for High Sheriff Col. Cushing, and illustrates the parson's style of sarcasm. I conclude this with a hint at his argument relative to not reading the Declaration. Bailey's claim was that in so refusing he was not guilty of contempt of authority, because it was simply a requisition from the council, and could not obtain the nature and force of a law. It was from one branch of the legislative body only. And farther, the council has not directly ordered ministers to read the Declaration, and gives no directions from whom this requisition is to proceed. He observed, too, that no penalty was annexed to the order, and by the English constitution no penalty could be inflicted. Disobedience to a royal proclamation, or even an act of par-

liament, without a penalty, cannot subject an offender to any punishment, for in every law, before it can operate, the authority which enacts it must specify both the crime and its penalty. "It is true the offence alleged is contempt of authority, and that is a crime which deserves punishment. I answer that the authority offended ought either to take cognizance of the matter, or to delegate proper persons to determine the case, and where regard is had to the liberties of the people the punishment will undoubtedly be specified. No penalty can be annexed after the crime is committed."

The offence of praying for the king seems to have been lost sight of, and finally Mr. Bailey was discharged.

His writings during this period sparkle with both humor and irony. For instance, we are told in Mr. Bartlet's book that a liberty pole was erected to offend him. But it says nothing about that pole being cut down. It was cut down, and Mr. Bailey was looked upon as the instigator of the act, and he wrote a letter disclaiming his connection with the cutting. Among the reasons why he was sorry for the act, he says that if one pole would give his neighbors so much pleasure it were better to have a thousand than merely one. But he adds, "you are sensible that liberty may subsist without any pole at all; and if all the pines, spruces and firs were lying prone upon the ground it would not elevate tyranny a bit." And again, he will no longer wonder at the heathen adoring images of wood or stone, since he finds so many professed Christians paying homage to a pole. When the revolutionists made raids on tea to the extent of making a teapot of the Kennebec River, his sympathies were with poor innocent tea that never harmed anybody. And his letters during this period almost always contain appeals to his correspondents for tea. After Massachusetts government granted his request for permission to depart for Nova Scotia, the season was so far advanced that he was unable to get away in 1778, and during the winter at the request of members of his parish he thought to conduct divine service. Cushing forbade it, and in no very mild or gentlemanly terms, characterizing his congregation as a nest of d——d tories. Mr. Bailey responded that he did not suppose the United States could possibly be in danger if he ministered to his people. Bowman and Cushing were determined to drive him to leave his church and either imprison him or force him to take the oath of allegiance to Congress. They attempted to prevent Massachusetts General Court from granting him permission to depart in peace, and even after that

permission was granted they sought to annoy him.

Finally, in the summer of 1779 he succeeded in chartering a small schooner of two brothers named Light and with part of his effects, his wife and infant son, and a heavy heart, he commenced his long and wearisome journey to Halifax. He could not, however, think of anything but a speedy return to the scene of his labors. His letters to friends left at Pownalborough constantly alluded to his hopes of a return. But the American cause prevailed and prevented the realization of his wishes. Although John Silvester John Gardiner read prayers for a while in his church at Pownalborough, and Mr. Bailey wrote him about being ordained for that parish, the church and parsonage, being stripped by vandal hands, soon went to decay, and the missionary settled at Annapolis, and after a long pastorate, died in 1808, and was buried in the old cemetery adjoining the fort about which for more than a hundred years the English and French contended for supremacy in North America. Last summer it was my privilege to stand upon the site of his church there, to visit the old cemetery, and to converse with and share the hospitality of his grandchildren. During his life there he was as industrious as he had been while on the Kennebec. He travelled much in the Annapolis valley and elsewhere, and left minute descriptions of the country, then sparsely settled. He made observations on the minerals of Nova Scotia, especially in Cumberland county, long before the mines were worked. The story of the Acadians interested him.

His writings show him to be possessed of a most Catholic spirit. He shared the average Protestant's antipathy to what he called the Romish church, and yet he extended a generous hospitality to some French Jesuit priests who called on him while in Pownalborough. Indeed, in his M S. History of the Eastern Country, after giving an account of the destruction of Father Ralle's mission at Norridgewock, he pays a warm tribute to the self-sacrificing zeal, the education and culture of the Jesuit, and closes his narrative by affirming that "though mistaken in his religious and political principles, he honestly endeavored to support the welfare of his disciples, and to pursue the dictates of his conscience; but like other upright men he perished in the cause he labored to maintain, and by the power he most heartily despised. To blacken the moral character of a person for no other reason than because his country, education, and interest are opposed to our own, is narrow, base and ungenerous." Of his account of this affair he

affirms that as he has read every printed account, and talked with those who were with the expedition, he believes his to be as nearly correct as any.

I find him always a champion of the Indian, although he does not attempt to hide the fact of the Indian's wanton cruelty to captives, at times. But as he was himself witness to wanton acts of duplicity on the part of the whites, he affirms that although his own ancestors had suffered at the hands of the Indian, yet he must declare that his sympathies were with the savage, and he pays warm tribute to the character of Bonazeen and other chieftains. Of the Lovewell fight at Fryeburg, he declares that it was the outcome of a bounty offered by Massachusetts on Indian scalps, and the only heroism displayed was by the savages. Young men from Boston then included Indians in their list of game, just as to-day they regard Maine as only a game preserve kept for their pleasure and profit. Mr. Bailey delighted to puncture the bubble of Puritanism, although he speaks highly of the character of many of the fathers of New England. He says that when the colonists who first settled Massachusetts Bay, left England they signed a letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury, the bishops, clergy, and brethren of the Church of England wherein "They earnestly request their petitions to heaven: allow them to be nearest to the throne of divine mercy, and entreat them not to regard any reports to their disadvantage which might arise from the disaffection and indiscretion of particular persons. They profess that the body of their company esteem it an honor to call the Church of England their dear mother, and that they cannot forsake their native country without much sadness of heart and many tears. They acknowledge that the hope and interest they had obtained in the common salvation they had received in her bosom and sucked from her breasts. They bless God for their parentage and education in this church, and as members of the same body declare they shall always rejoice in her safety and unfeignedly grieve for any sorrow that shall ever betide her; and while they have any breath will sincerely desire and endeavor to continue her welfare with the enlargement of her bounds." Mr. Bailey thinks that does not look as if our forefathers fled into this howling wilderness to avoid persecution, as he affirms was believed by multitudes. In the second volume of Hutchinson's MS. History of Massachusetts Bay, which MS. forms Vol. 28 Mass. Archives, and still has the mud stains which it received when thrown into the street at the time Gov. Hutchinson's house was mobbed in 1765.

occurs the same statements. The MS. was discovered by W. F. Poole, late librarian of Chicago Public Library, and I am informed that as a volume it has never been printed. I do not think Mr. Bailey could have seen that from which to cull his statements. He affirms that the Puritans, so-called, who settled Massachusetts, were naturally devout, ambitious, desirous of enjoying civil and religious liberty themselves, but unwilling to grant the privilege to others. But they were impatient of restraint, and could they have arrived at dignity and power in England we should not have heard them complain of the Hierarchy.

Later he speaks of their tyranny and intolerance; and after giving a vivid account of the trials at the time of the degrading witchcraft superstition, he affirms that "It is somewhat curious that 22 persons out of 28 were females. It must have been, I conceive, a prevailing article of faith in those times that women are more easily seduced into a correspondence with the malignant spirits of darkness than men." Mr. Bailey affirms that the examination of persons charged was too indecent for publication even then. And as for pathetic interest, I know nothing surpassing volume 135 Massachusetts State papers, unless it be the volumes relating to the French Neutrals, or Acadians. Mr. Bailey's detailed account is very minute. At times he quotes from Hutchinson. A single quotation from Bailey must suffice at present:—"Mr. Samuel Wardwell, when first apprehended and accused, confessed himself guilty of witchcraft, and though he afterwards solemnly recanted his confession, yet he fell a sacrifice to the fury of his adversaries, and what was peculiarly severe and cruel in his affair, his own wife and daughter were admitted as evidences against him, by which means they were able to save their own lives. The daughter, indeed, upon a second inquiry denied the guilt of her parent, but the wife upon this circumstance in his favor, was never permitted another examination." Massachusetts did not fully recover from the effects of this delusion for more than half a century, or until Mr. Bailey was entering college.

He was most industrious. His garden occupied much of his time, and he searched all New England for fruits, vegetables and flowers for it. He gave much attention to the fauna and flora of his section, and his MS. History of the Eastern Country, designed for publication, remained unprinted because both he and his proposed printer were loyalists and were obliged to leave the country. His description of the soil, scenery, rivers, bays, harbors, islands, forests, animals, &c., of the section were very minute. His account of the destruction of Falmouth

*Bannister*  
by Mowitt in 1775, which he witnessed, is printed in Vol. 5, Collections of the Maine Historical Society. In a letter to John Gardiner, then a law student in London, in the year 1765, Mr. Bailey gives a very glowing account of the progress of the new settlement in Pownalborough,—that new farms were being rapidly cleared, all the land was taken up, manufactures started, and vessels loaded there direct for Europe. Land was worth more in what is now Dresden, about that time, than it is at present.

He gives an account of the Indian raid on Swan Island in 1750, when the Whidden-Noble family was carried off, and tells a humorous story of the frightened soldier who reported to Capt. Lithgow at Fort Richmond that he got the news of the murder of Capt. Whidden and his whole family from Capt. Whidden's own mouth.

Of the conference with the Indians by Sir Wm. Pepperell, and others, commissioners appointed by Gov. Shirley, in 1753, Mr. Bailey affirms that the Indians got the better of the commissioners in argument. I expect soon to obtain a photographic copy of the original parchment treaty negotiated at that time at Fort Richmond.

In his very minute description of the flora of this eastern country he calls our butternut tree the lemon walnut, and in speaking of the vegetable products affirms that 800 bushels of potatoes per acre had been raised. And he mentions Capt. Whidden's 50 bushels of wheat from a bushel of seed, on Swan Island.

Of natural phenomena, he affirms that the Auroral light was first observed in New England in 1715. The Memorial History of Boston gives the year 1719. His description of the climate and weather might have been written to-day. There has been no change. And his account of the Kennebec scenery is true to nature, and finely written. He speaks of islands and says Seguin was wooded, which is true, as it was not cleared of trees until 1795, when the first light-house was established there. In his account of rivers, he gives the lake Sebim as the source of the Kennebec. By whom was it called Moosehead? His chapter on bays and harbors on our coast is as short as is a certain chapter on snakes in Ireland, for he says the whole coast is a succession of bays and harbors, and then he stops.

*C/*  
When we consider the wildness of his surroundings, the means of communication, and the privations incident to the situation, we wonder how he could write so much and oftentimes travel 10, 20, or 50 miles by water or through a wilderness to conduct a service or marry a couple.

I am not Episcopalian; but I am at a loss to see how one could fail to acknowledge that so far as a church may own any section of country, the field was his. Massachusetts Puritans never occupied it; and after his departure 22 years elapsed before the zeal of men like Bowman and Cushing gave Dresden a church edifice, and the devoted Parker settled there. Bailey's people were certainly united until the gentry of Pownalborough sowed the seeds of discord. With many dissenting churches, the lack of some form of service has no doubt tended to make church going with many a mere fad or fashion, the fashionable music being at times supplemented by a sensational discourse by a popular minister. A lady in Nova Scotia, of the communion of the Church of England, told me that she esteemed it a duty and a pleasure to participate in the service of her church, even if she never listened to a sermon.

I have endeavored to give you my impressions of the old-time missionary of Pownalborough, as gleaned from a careful study of the manuscripts which he left. My self-imposed task is as yet far from complete. While I hope that much ~~of what~~ he wrote may yet be printed, to give extended quotations from what I have as yet been able to decipher of the time-stained, faded, torn, and mice-eaten papers would only weary you. So far as I have been able to verify his statements by comparison with other documents in existence, I have found him to be accurate and conscientious. His influence over his people was great. I have ~~as yet~~ looked in vain for the names of any as among Massachusetts Revolutionary soldiers who were known to be indentified, actively, with his church. In the examination of documents, and in the work of recording, I have no theories to prove, and only feel bound to go where the records lead me. But I now know that old Pownalborough, and indeed all of Maine, has a grand history which I little suspected existed, and which partial and narrow Massachusetts historians have entirely ignored. Think, for instance, of a sketch of John Gardiner which makes no mention whatever of the fact that when he made his famous speech in Massachusetts legislature in favor of removing restrictions on theatres he represented a Kennebec town in that body. I affirm that since studying the papers left by the loyalist, Jacob Bailey, I am better fitted for an understanding of the true story of the great American Republic. A real patriot will honor his own section, his country, its people, its institutions, and he will not slander others. Jingoism is not true patriotism. I sometimes think when I

which

see the veneration felt by English subjects for their queen, the reverence of the German for his emperor, even the faith of the Russian in his ruler, and contrast it with the ridicule, the falsehoods, and the abuse which our so-called chief magistrate receives, that the average American reveres nothing but plutocracy and pugilism. Is America really great, or merely overgrown, dropsical, as it were? Did those of us who fought in the late civil war contend for a nation in the true sense of the word, or for an unwieldy collection of peoples with diverse interests, bound together only by a slender thread of selfish gain? Mr. Bailey thanked his good fortune that when he landed in Halifax, penniless, he was at last in a land of freedom as contrasted with the realm of discord and tyranny which he had left. Are we quite sure that we know what the much used and abused word freedom really means? Do we use up the article in repeating the word? Certain it is that when we consider the treatment given the American Loyalists of a hundred years ago, we must admit that Republics may be needlessly severe and tyrannical. Is any man un-American when he affirms this?

Mr. Bailey has been called eccentric. Also unyielding. These terms are contradictory, and show that those who used them knew nothing about the subject of which they spoke. His opponents were, as he expressed it, "like the weather cock on yonder steeple." And they were the ones who would not yield. Even after he had obtained permission to leave the country they still pursued him. When he consented to leave out the objectionable passages from his church service, he still thought it no harm to pray for the King. He might have said that the King needed praying for. Taking the oath they insisted upon would have proved his ruin. I do not find that they insisted upon it with his friends Abiel Wood and Major Goodwin, both of whom spoke words of kindly sympathy to him and who were as much Tory as he.

These events have long since passed, and it would seem that the time had come for Americans to view them dispassionately. And when the time is ripe, we may learn to revere the memory of the brave Itinerant Missionary of the Kennebec wilderness, as we study his character portrayed in the manuscripts which have come to us.

?/